

allied to the bird alluded to, but will differ slightly in the markings of the cheeks and throat, and seems to have the lengthened plumes springing from the axillæ only, whereas in the other they arise from the whole lower part of the back. If we are right in this bird being distinct, a second species will tend to confirm the separation of the form to a subgenus; for independent of the remarkable development of the dorsal and axillary plumes, there are other differences which would warrant a removal when a few species exhibited similar characters. It is probable also that *Timalia maculata*, Temm., pl. 593, where the plumage exhibits an inclination to lengthen and become disunited, would also range with them.—*Timalia nigricollis*, pl. 594, said to be found in Borneo and not hitherto discovered in Java or Sumatra, we have received from both of the latter islands and also from the Malayan Peninsula.—*Eurylavinus psittacinus*, pl. 598. The only difference which we can perceive in this figure from that of a beautiful species from continental India, is in the tail being more lengthened and coloured entirely of an ultramarine tint. The bird we allude to is that named *E. Dalhousii* in the ‘Edinb. New Phil. Journ.’ for 1829, figured by Mr. Royle in his *Botany, &c. of the Himalayan Mountains*, beautifully represented by Mr. Gould in his ‘*Icones Avium*,’ under the subgeneric title of *Crossodera*, and lastly indicated by Mr. Swainson in his ‘*Classification of Birds*,’ as *psarisomus*. At present we consider the two birds identical, and that reference to the descriptions alluded to if they are not so would have tended to illustrate the subject. The specimens which have reached Britain have we believe been all received from continental India, principally from the Himalayan and Nipal districts, while M. Temminck’s birds have been found in the mountain forests of the interior of Sumatra. “La découverte en est due à M. Muller.” The concluding *Livraison* contains a copious “*Tableau Méthodique*” and the title pages, besides a few supplementary observations upon some of the descriptions published in the course of the work.

*Flora Lipsiensis Excursoria*, Auctore G. L. Petermann. Lipsiæ, 1838.  
J. A. Barth.

This excellent little work has just reached us, and we rejoice in introducing it to the notice of English botanists. The book contains full generic and specific characters of 1316 flowering plants which grow in the neighbourhood of Leipsic, and these not merely compiled from other works, as is unfortunately often the case in local Floras, but drawn up with great care from the examination of the plants themselves. The arrangement is Linnæan, with the omission

allied to the bird alluded to, but will differ slightly in the markings of the cheeks and throat, and seems to have the lengthened plumes springing from the axillæ only, whereas in the other they arise from the whole lower part of the back. If we are right in this bird being distinct, a second species will tend to confirm the separation of the form to a subgenus; for independent of the remarkable development of the dorsal and axillary plumes, there are other differences which would warrant a removal when a few species exhibited similar characters. It is probable also that *Timalia maculata*, Temm., pl. 593, where the plumage exhibits an inclination to lengthen and become disunited, would also range with them.—*Timalia nigricollis*, pl. 594, said to be found in Borneo and not hitherto discovered in Java or Sumatra, we have received from both of the latter islands and also from the Malayan Peninsula.—*Eurylavinus psittacinus*, pl. 598. The only difference which we can perceive in this figure from that of a beautiful species from continental India, is in the tail being more lengthened and coloured entirely of an ultramarine tint. The bird we allude to is that named *E. Dalhousii* in the ‘Edinb. New Phil. Journ.’ for 1829, figured by Mr. Royle in his *Botany, &c.* of the Himalayan Mountains, beautifully represented by Mr. Gould in his ‘*Icones Avium*,’ under the subgeneric title of *Crossodera*, and lastly indicated by Mr. Swainson in his ‘*Classification of Birds*,’ as *psarisomus*. At present we consider the two birds identical, and that reference to the descriptions alluded to if they are not so would have tended to illustrate the subject. The specimens which have reached Britain have we believe been all received from continental India, principally from the Himalayan and Nipal districts, while M. Temminck’s birds have been found in the mountain forests of the interior of Sumatra. “*La découverte en est due à M. Muller.*” The concluding *Livraison* contains a copious “*Tableau Méthodique*” and the title pages, besides a few supplementary observations upon some of the descriptions published in the course of the work.

*Flora Lipsiensis Excursoria*, Auctore G. L. Petermann. Lipsiæ, 1838.  
J. A. Barth.

This excellent little work has just reached us, and we rejoice in introducing it to the notice of English botanists. The book contains full generic and specific characters of 1316 flowering plants which grow in the neighbourhood of Leipsic, and these not merely compiled from other works, as is unfortunately often the case in local Floras, but drawn up with great care from the examination of the plants themselves. The arrangement is Linnæan, with the omission

allied to the bird alluded to, but will differ slightly in the markings of the cheeks and throat, and seems to have the lengthened plumes springing from the axillæ only, whereas in the other they arise from the whole lower part of the back. If we are right in this bird being distinct, a second species will tend to confirm the separation of the form to a subgenus; for independent of the remarkable development of the dorsal and axillary plumes, there are other differences which would warrant a removal when a few species exhibited similar characters. It is probable also that *Timalia maculata*, Temm., pl. 593, where the plumage exhibits an inclination to lengthen and become disunited, would also range with them.—*Timalia nigricollis*, pl. 594, said to be found in Borneo and not hitherto discovered in Java or Sumatra, we have received from both of the latter islands and also from the Malayan Peninsula.—*Eurylavinus psittacinus*, pl. 598. The only difference which we can perceive in this figure from that of a beautiful species from continental India, is in the tail being more lengthened and coloured entirely of an ultramarine tint. The bird we allude to is that named *E. Dalhousii* in the ‘Edinb. New Phil. Journ.’ for 1829, figured by Mr. Royle in his *Botany, &c.* of the Himalayan Mountains, beautifully represented by Mr. Gould in his ‘*Icones Avium*,’ under the subgeneric title of *Crossodera*, and lastly indicated by Mr. Swainson in his ‘*Classification of Birds*,’ as *psarisomus*. At present we consider the two birds identical, and that reference to the descriptions alluded to if they are not so would have tended to illustrate the subject. The specimens which have reached Britain have we believe been all received from continental India, principally from the Himalayan and Nipal districts, while M. Temminck’s birds have been found in the mountain forests of the interior of Sumatra. “La découverte en est due à M. Muller.” The concluding *Livraison* contains a copious “*Tableau Méthodique*” and the title pages, besides a few supplementary observations upon some of the descriptions published in the course of the work.

*Flora Lipsiensis Excursoria*, Auctore G. L. Petermann. Lipsiæ, 1838.  
J. A. Barth.

This excellent little work has just reached us, and we rejoice in introducing it to the notice of English botanists. The book contains full generic and specific characters of 1316 flowering plants which grow in the neighbourhood of Leipsic, and these not merely compiled from other works, as is unfortunately often the case in local Floras, but drawn up with great care from the examination of the plants themselves. The arrangement is Linnæan, with the omission

allied to the bird alluded to, but will differ slightly in the markings of the cheeks and throat, and seems to have the lengthened plumes springing from the axillæ only, whereas in the other they arise from the whole lower part of the back. If we are right in this bird being distinct, a second species will tend to confirm the separation of the form to a subgenus; for independent of the remarkable development of the dorsal and axillary plumes, there are other differences which would warrant a removal when a few species exhibited similar characters. It is probable also that *Timalia maculata*, Temm., pl. 593, where the plumage exhibits an inclination to lengthen and become disunited, would also range with them.—*Timalia nigricollis*, pl. 594, said to be found in Borneo and not hitherto discovered in Java or Sumatra, we have received from both of the latter islands and also from the Malayan Peninsula.—*Eurylavinus psittacinus*, pl. 598. The only difference which we can perceive in this figure from that of a beautiful species from continental India, is in the tail being more lengthened and coloured entirely of an ultramarine tint. The bird we allude to is that named *E. Dalhousii* in the ‘Edinb. New Phil. Journ.’ for 1829, figured by Mr. Royle in his *Botany, &c. of the Himalayan Mountains*, beautifully represented by Mr. Gould in his ‘*Icones Avium*,’ under the subgeneric title of *Crossodera*, and lastly indicated by Mr. Swainson in his ‘*Classification of Birds*,’ as *psarisomus*. At present we consider the two birds identical, and that reference to the descriptions alluded to if they are not so would have tended to illustrate the subject. The specimens which have reached Britain have we believe been all received from continental India, principally from the Himalayan and Nipal districts, while M. Temminck’s birds have been found in the mountain forests of the interior of Sumatra. “La découverte en est due à M. Muller.” The concluding *Livraison* contains a copious “*Tableau Méthodique*” and the title pages, besides a few supplementary observations upon some of the descriptions published in the course of the work.

*Flora Lipsiensis Excursoria*, Auctore G. L. Petermann. Lipsiæ, 1838.  
J. A. Barth.

This excellent little work has just reached us, and we rejoice in introducing it to the notice of English botanists. The book contains full generic and specific characters of 1316 flowering plants which grow in the neighbourhood of Leipsic, and these not merely compiled from other works, as is unfortunately often the case in local Floras, but drawn up with great care from the examination of the plants themselves. The arrangement is Linnæan, with the omission

of the classes *Dodecandria*, *Monœcia*, *Diœcia*, and *Polygamia*. Several new species are given, namely :

1. *Carex Lipsiensis* separated from *C. Oederi* by its ascending, not erect growth, shorter rostrum, narrower leaves, and ovate not ovate-oblong bracteas. We suspect that this cannot be considered as more than a variety, even if *C. Oederi* is distinct from *C. flava*.

2. *Arrhenatherum biaristatum*, distinguished by having both its florets furnished with kneed awns.

3. *Campanula cordata*, differing from *C. Trachelium* by having all its leaves cordate and stalked, flowers separate (singuli), calyx hispid, with ovate-suboblong segments.

4. *Stellaria flaccida*, "debilitate insignis, viridis; flores fere *S. glauca*, habitus *S. graminea*; caulis lævis, glaber, ramosissimus, ramis 9—12 pollicaribus, filiformibus; folia angustissima, glabra, lævia, corymbus axillaris, et sub anthesi caule ipso brevior; pedicelluli elongati, filiformes; bracteolæ scariosæ, herbaceo-uninerviæ, una alterave serratura instructæ, glabræ."

5. *Betonica recurvidens*, separated from *B. officinalis* by its ovate-lanceolate strongly serrated cauline leaves, the serratures patent and "apice subrecurvis."

6. *Hypericum medium*. This plant is an intermediate form between *H. perforatum* and *tetrapterum*; from the latter it is distinguished by its terete scarcely 2-edged stem, and sessile not amplexicaul leaves, of which the lower are without pellucid dots; from the former its differences appear to be very slight, depending upon its shorter leaves, the lower of which are not punctured, smaller corolla, which is but little longer than the calyx, and never "dorso nigro punctata."

7. *Hypericum decumbens*. This appears to be the variety of *H. humifusum* with pointed and glandularly serrated sepals, and we think ought not to be separated from that plant.

8. *Leontodon validus*, said to be a much stronger, taller, and more branched plant than *L. autumnalis*, but we do not see how it is to be distinguished unless it is by its longer style.

We have not space to give any further extracts from this valuable contribution to European descriptive botany, which we trust will soon be in the hands of all working botanists. We must however protest against the extensive introduction of new terms, both names of parts and descriptive, with which the book abounds, even more than most of the modern German Floras. We know of no good attending this practice, and are quite certain that it is a very troublesome and puzzling one, not only to young botanists, but also to those who are much more advanced in the study of the science.

of the classes *Dodecandria*, *Monœcia*, *Diœcia*, and *Polygamia*. Several new species are given, namely :

1. *Carex Lipsiensis* separated from *C. Oederi* by its ascending, not erect growth, shorter rostrum, narrower leaves, and ovate not ovate-oblong bracteas. We suspect that this cannot be considered as more than a variety, even if *C. Oederi* is distinct from *C. flava*.

2. *Arrhenatherum biaristatum*, distinguished by having both its florets furnished with kneed awns.

3. *Campanula cordata*, differing from *C. Trachelium* by having all its leaves cordate and stalked, flowers separate (singuli), calyx hispid, with ovate-suboblong segments.

4. *Stellaria flaccida*, "debilitate insignis, viridis; flores fere *S. glauca*, habitus *S. graminea*; caulis lævis, glaber, ramosissimus, ramis 9—12 pollicaribus, filiformibus; folia angustissima, glabra, lævia, corymbus axillaris, et sub anthesi caule ipso brevior; pedicelluli elongati, filiformes; bracteolæ scariosæ, herbaceo-uninerviæ, una alterave serratura instructæ, glabræ."

5. *Betonica recurvidens*, separated from *B. officinalis* by its ovate-lanceolate strongly serrated cauline leaves, the serratures patent and "apice subrecurvis."

6. *Hypericum medium*. This plant is an intermediate form between *H. perforatum* and *tetrapterum*; from the latter it is distinguished by its terete scarcely 2-edged stem, and sessile not amplexicaul leaves, of which the lower are without pellucid dots; from the former its differences appear to be very slight, depending upon its shorter leaves, the lower of which are not punctured, smaller corolla, which is but little longer than the calyx, and never "dorso nigro punctata."

7. *Hypericum decumbens*. This appears to be the variety of *H. humifusum* with pointed and glandularly serrated sepals, and we think ought not to be separated from that plant.

8. *Leontodon validus*, said to be a much stronger, taller, and more branched plant than *L. autumnalis*, but we do not see how it is to be distinguished unless it is by its longer style.

We have not space to give any further extracts from this valuable contribution to European descriptive botany, which we trust will soon be in the hands of all working botanists. We must however protest against the extensive introduction of new terms, both names of parts and descriptive, with which the book abounds, even more than most of the modern German Floras. We know of no good attending this practice, and are quite certain that it is a very troublesome and puzzling one, not only to young botanists, but also to those who are much more advanced in the study of the science.

of the classes *Dodecandria*, *Monœcia*, *Diœcia*, and *Polygamia*. Several new species are given, namely :

1. *Carex Lipsiensis* separated from *C. Oederi* by its ascending, not erect growth, shorter rostrum, narrower leaves, and ovate not ovate-oblong bracteas. We suspect that this cannot be considered as more than a variety, even if *C. Oederi* is distinct from *C. flava*.

2. *Arrhenatherum biaristatum*, distinguished by having both its florets furnished with kneed awns.

3. *Campanula cordata*, differing from *C. Trachelium* by having all its leaves cordate and stalked, flowers separate (singuli), calyx hispid, with ovate-suboblong segments.

4. *Stellaria flaccida*, "debilitate insignis, viridis; flores fere *S. glauca*, habitus *S. graminea*; caulis lævis, glaber, ramosissimus, ramis 9—12 pollicaribus, filiformibus; folia angustissima, glabra, lævia, corymbus axillaris, et sub anthesi caule ipso brevior; pedicelluli elongati, filiformes; bracteolæ scariosæ, herbaceo-uninerviæ, una alterave serratura instructæ, glabræ."

5. *Betonica recurvidens*, separated from *B. officinalis* by its ovate-lanceolate strongly serrated cauline leaves, the serratures patent and "apice subrecurvis."

6. *Hypericum medium*. This plant is an intermediate form between *H. perforatum* and *tetrapterum*; from the latter it is distinguished by its terete scarcely 2-edged stem, and sessile not amplexicaul leaves, of which the lower are without pellucid dots; from the former its differences appear to be very slight, depending upon its shorter leaves, the lower of which are not punctured, smaller corolla, which is but little longer than the calyx, and never "dorso nigro punctata."

7. *Hypericum decumbens*. This appears to be the variety of *H. humifusum* with pointed and glandularly serrated sepals, and we think ought not to be separated from that plant.

8. *Leontodon validus*, said to be a much stronger, taller, and more branched plant than *L. autumnalis*, but we do not see how it is to be distinguished unless it is by its longer style.

We have not space to give any further extracts from this valuable contribution to European descriptive botany, which we trust will soon be in the hands of all working botanists. We must however protest against the extensive introduction of new terms, both names of parts and descriptive, with which the book abounds, even more than most of the modern German Floras. We know of no good attending this practice, and are quite certain that it is a very troublesome and puzzling one, not only to young botanists, but also to those who are much more advanced in the study of the science.

of the classes *Dodecandria*, *Monœcia*, *Diœcia*, and *Polygamia*. Several new species are given, namely :

1. *Carex Lipsiensis* separated from *C. Oederi* by its ascending, not erect growth, shorter rostrum, narrower leaves, and ovate not ovate-oblong bracteas. We suspect that this cannot be considered as more than a variety, even if *C. Oederi* is distinct from *C. flava*.

2. *Arrhenatherum biaristatum*, distinguished by having both its florets furnished with kneed awns.

3. *Campanula cordata*, differing from *C. Trachelium* by having all its leaves cordate and stalked, flowers separate (singuli), calyx hispid, with ovate-suboblong segments.

4. *Stellaria flaccida*, "debilitate insignis, viridis; flores fere *S. glauca*, habitus *S. graminea*; caulis lævis, glaber, ramosissimus, ramis 9—12 pollicaribus, filiformibus; folia angustissima, glabra, lævia, corymbus axillaris, et sub anthesi caule ipso brevior; pedicelluli elongati, filiformes; bracteolæ scariosæ, herbaceo-uninerviæ, una alterave serratura instructæ, glabræ."

5. *Betonica recurvidens*, separated from *B. officinalis* by its ovate-lanceolate strongly serrated cauline leaves, the serratures patent and "apice subrecurvis."

6. *Hypericum medium*. This plant is an intermediate form between *H. perforatum* and *tetrapterum*; from the latter it is distinguished by its terete scarcely 2-edged stem, and sessile not amplexicaul leaves, of which the lower are without pellucid dots; from the former its differences appear to be very slight, depending upon its shorter leaves, the lower of which are not punctured, smaller corolla, which is but little longer than the calyx, and never "dorso nigro punctata."

7. *Hypericum decumbens*. This appears to be the variety of *H. humifusum* with pointed and glandularly serrated sepals, and we think ought not to be separated from that plant.

8. *Leontodon validus*, said to be a much stronger, taller, and more branched plant than *L. autumnalis*, but we do not see how it is to be distinguished unless it is by its longer style.

We have not space to give any further extracts from this valuable contribution to European descriptive botany, which we trust will soon be in the hands of all working botanists. We must however protest against the extensive introduction of new terms, both names of parts and descriptive, with which the book abounds, even more than most of the modern German Floras. We know of no good attending this practice, and are quite certain that it is a very troublesome and puzzling one, not only to young botanists, but also to those who are much more advanced in the study of the science.